THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII JULY, 1944 No. 289

Our Struggle

GERMAN pastors, now in this country, who took part in the Church struggle in Germany before the war, tell us that they can discern in our present state of affairs in England the earlier stages of a parallel development. When pressed to be more explicit they hesitate, for they know that in commenting on things English they are liable both to misunderstand and to be misunderstood. Thus they do not venture beyond hints, but we shall be wise to heed those hints and to consider whether they at all illuminate the signs of the times. My present purpose is to suggest that they are extremely illuminating and that the shape of the struggle, which in some form or other these experienced observers have expected for us, is already emerging.

An Englishman drawing a comparison between English tendencies now and German actualities before the war is only less liable to be misunderstood than a German. It is the brutality of active and physical persecution that has gripped our imagination and fills our picture of the German scene. Thus we are surprised and even shocked to discover that for those who have experienced the Church struggle such things are a side issue and, when it is suggested that there are similarities between the present situation in England and that in Germany when Hitler first came into power, we jump to the conclusion that what is forecast is the setting up here of concentration camps and so forth. "But that is not our way," we say, and doubtless we are right. English totalitarianism will employ gentler methods and is likely to be less thorough-going. Nevertheless it is a form of totalitarianism that looms ahead of us. Of the very diverse writers who proclaim it, some view the prospect with equanimity, others with consternation. Mr D. R. Davies, indeed, seems to be banking upon the idea that the fields of politics and economics can be surrendered and at the same time a free culture be preserved. I shall be so bold as to call Mr Davies an optimist! The crucial bulwark of freedom is the preservation of opposition—and not in one department alone, but in all, for they cannot be segregated. It seems possible that in future the Church may do its most pre-eminent service to the nation by acting as a stronghold, perhaps as in Germany the last stronghold, of opposition. But in any case the Church, if it is faithful to its trust, will continually find itself in the rôle of opposition towards a totalitarian state, not because that state is peculiarly evil—its benevolence or malevolence is incidental—but because it will inevitably inherit or concoct an ideology which it will expect the Church to accept and to sanctify.

What, then, is likely to be the ideology of a totalitarian or indeed of any post-war Britain? There are several candidates for the post—

Marxism, Scientific Humanism, the various idealizations of the "English Tradition." But the position of favourite must undoubtedly be given to what is variously called "a Christian civilization" or "the Principles of Christianity" or "Christian Ethics." It is neither here nor there that this national religion (it has a God called Providence) is patently inadequate, has already been tried and proved a failure, and is founded upon nothing more than the emaciated leave-over of the more robust faith of former generations. Any ship in a storm—it satisfies the public and is unobjectionable to the majority of its rivals. Already it has captured most of the press and is well on the way to capturing the schools. It parades to church on special Sundays, for it is not yet sufficiently sure of itself to throw the Church over, but it believes very little of what it hears there. It observes Christmas, but in honour, not of the Incarnation, but of goodwill. It has its influential and popular prophets. It was, I think, Mr J. B. Priestley who said in a Christmas broadcast that for the purposes of a Christian civilization it seemed to him to matter little whether you accepted any of the Christian doctrines. His statement will have received the inward applause, not only of the vast majority of his listeners, but of not a few who had attended their parish churches that very morning.

But this national religion is likely in the first instance to seek to take over the Church, and only if and when the Church refuses to fall in with its plans will it throw over the Church. Then perhaps it will not merely disestablish the Church but establish another or, more probably, those who remain faithful to the religion of the Church will find themselves Non-Jurors. We shall have "British Christians" in the place of power (accommodated perhaps in the cathedrals and parish churches) as we have had "German Christians." Demands will be made; the ultimatum will be delivered. We must abandon Paul, not because he was a Jew but because he was a theologian. We must abandon the Gospel and teach "the Principles of Christianity." We must become, not Nazis, but Pelagians. Already there are increasing indications of this demand in the correspondence columns of the press and elsewhere. It becomes more undisguisedly anti-clerical, a frame of mind which is significantly in greater evidence among the ardent exponents of non-doctrinal Christianity than among avowed unbelievers. To equate Christianity with what was taught by Christ and His twelve apostles is to be bigoted—dreadful sin! This demand for a Church cut to the measure of twentieth-century disbelief, attuned to the swan song of a declining civilization—this demand will grow, it will rise like a flood about the rock of our faith. How precarious our hold!

For we can hardly regard our fitness for such a struggle with complacency. It is a situation full of the very dangers to which the Church of England in particular is most vulnerable. Compromise is in our blood, and indeed it is very far from being always an evil. By means of compromise Anglicanism has preserved within itself essential tensions which have elsewhere been one-sidedly resolved. It is one of our genuine glories that we are a large room and the temper which has gone to make us so is a precious possession to be jealously preserved. But even a large room must have walls; otherwise it ceases to be a

room at all. There have been significant claims made openly of late (by writers whose tongues were sometimes perhaps in their cheeks) that no degree of disbelief is inconsistent with membership of the National Church." To preserve the fiction of being a National Church may in the new circumstances of to-day be in itself immensely dangerous. Certainly it will lead to a temptation to preserve our status, and that from perfectly worthy motives, at the cost of our integrity. Thus the stand that must eventually be made is put off further and further. Counsels of expediency prevail. We must not "lose" anybody, and always there is the nightmare of the immense structure which we have erected in the palmy days and which must somehow be financed. Much of it has, to tell the truth, become mere embarrassing lumber—the large church building, for instance, with next to no congregation—but our honour, our very existence, seems bound up with it and we sell our soul in tactfulness towards unbelief in order to maintain it.

For assuredly the effect of a stand would be extremely devastating upon large sections of the rank and file of the Church. German pastors have told us that at the beginning of their pre-war struggle the most baffling problem of all was how to make their own people understand what they were struggling about. Hitler was all for religion, its champion against atheist Bolshevism. Why this fuss, even though he did wish to purge the Bible of Semitism and introduce some good old Germanic customs and traditions? And surely it was an excellent idea to bring all the sects into enforced unity in a really national Church expressive of the new national ideals! There is a familiar ring about all this. How easily it can be translated into terms of our own situation! We should find, we are finding it no less difficult to show our people what is at stake in defending the religion of the Bible against the encroachments of mere sanctified humanism. To many of them the Church is primarily part of the English tradition, part of the famous British Constitution. That is the real basis of their adherence. Indeed, some young political Conservatives have recently stated that this is the one real value that they attach to the Church. They were expressing openly what is a widespread half-conscious sentiment. But though it may be, as we are often told, one of the merits of the Church of England that it is "so very English," this will hardly prove a great motive for staunch churchmanship in a struggle over fundamentals. For it is not in its faithfulness to the Creeds that the Church of England is characteristically English, but merely in its illogicalities. Rather it may be doubted whether its faithfulness to the Creeds does not now disqualify it for the claim to be representative of a people which has largely abandoned belief in them.

That is the point which we are loath to face. We produce to ourselves and to the world every other reason for the neglect of public worship—a general slackness, the Sunday opening of cinemas, parades during church-time. But in fact these are results, not causes. The cause is disbelief, still largely undetected because it is still a little ashamed and regretful, and therefore is not openly professed nor even fully realized by most of those who have succumbed to it. An as yet unexhausted tradition of assent and occasional conformity among large sections of

the population enables us to deceive ourselves and to keep up appearances while we argue about and plan for a situation that has ceased to exist. Thus in the controversy within the Church over the Education Bill both sides have shown an astonishing wishfulness. On the one hand, the ardent supporters of denominational schools have imagined that they might still get what in the England of to-day no Government could possibly give. This great cry about the rights of the parents will not bear examination, since all but an inconsiderable minority of them are pure Gallios in the matter. Churchmen, on the other hand, who urge us to receive the Bill with cries of gratitude, seem to have deluded themselves into supposing that the teaching of an inoffensive, "lowest common denominator," Christianity in the schools will form the background to and will lead up to the genuine article. On the contrary, it will be accepted as a substitute. It is a rival religion. To face the inevitabilities of what is happening is one thing; it is quite another to assist as a choir of praise at the enthronement of the supplanter in what is assumed to be the key position.

But the educational conflict is but a single sector in a battle embracing every department of life. It is up to now the sector in which the lines of battle have been most clearly drawn. What is most necessary is that the whole issue in its full scope should be clarified, for it is complicated and obscured by appearances, inherited relics of the past, and not least by the fact that almost everybody wishes to claim the sanction and name of Christianity for their theories and programs, however little relation they may bear to the New Testament Gospel. Up to now we have shown ourselves very ready to acquiesce in this widespread purloining of the title of Christian. We have been very nice. We would not give offence. Above all we have built up fond hopes on the prevalence of what is called "diffused Christianity." But in fact, if the present diagnosis of the situation be true, "diffused Christianity" is seen to be not an ally, but the potential enemy. Admittedly it is the relic of a more complete Christianity, but it is not a more complete Christianity in embryo. It will not provide a basis of revival, for not only is it too far gone for that—it has become a substitute religion. It is based on a different set of doctrines. It is set up against the religion of the Bible and the Church. It is a heresy; the Confessional Church in Germany made no bones about that word and neither should we. Here are two irreconcilables—the Gospel and "British Christianity"—and sooner or later the battle must be openly joined. Till now we follow a policy of appeasement. The Church attends its Munichs, all the more dangerous because it meets at them, not Hitler, but genuinely well-meaning gentlemen. But now it is vitally important that at least we separate a confused and confusing situation into its real constituents in order that we may look at it straight. We can no longer afford the comforting illusions.

For upon our expectations for the future will depend our immediate policy and aims. If it is a mere optimistic "after the war," then we shall continue to drift, to dream sweet dreams, to bolster up. If, on the other hand, a struggle is to be expected, what then should be our aim, to what should be given the primary attention? Surely our best efforts

should go to the creation of stalwarts, firmly grounded in their faith, and who will understand something of what is happening and therefore be ready to stand undismayed. For there is a real danger that, as this extremely testing situation develops, the faith of our most faithful people may be shaken and even shattered by events because we have failed to prepare them. In any case the Church cannot in such a struggle expect to carry with it more than a minority of its adherents. There is no good reason for supposing that here it will be more successful in this respect than the Confessional Church in Germany. Rather the demands upon staunchness will here be more exacting, since the glow of martyrdom will be lacking. It is harder to seem to fail, to be despised, outmoded, than to undergo active persecution which carries with it an heroic glory. That glory is likely to be denied to the faithful in England. English tolerance will deprive the struggle of its dramatic flavour. The victories will be won, not in concentration camps, but by determined participation in all but deserted sacraments. What could be harder? The first concern, then, should be for potential stalwarts. Not that attention should or can be wholly concentrated on them, but it will be well to consider whether much time and energy is not at present being expended on barren undertakings and on seeking to salvage heirlooms that have long been doomed. Struggle demands a new strategy, and part of that strategy will be a somewhat ruthless concentration on what is productive and worth-while.

We are often told that England has become once again a missionary country. The question then arises whether some of the primitive discipline which still obtains in other parts of the mission-field should not be restored, whether indeed its restoration is not essential for our very survival in this new situation. It is curious and perhaps significant that any notion of ecclesiastical discipline has come to be almost exclusively concerned with the liturgical eccentricities of the clergy. Less is said of the indiscipline of laymen who neglect every ministration of the Church save Baptism, Matrimony and Burial. (These last are often carried out with more than usual pomp for those of them who are well endowed with this world's goods.) Yet the Church of England has its terms of communion, more stringent than the pitiful qualifications for a place on the electoral roll. There is the rubric, which demands a minimum of communicating three times a year, of which Easter shall be one. What, in fact, is the relation to the Church of those who neglect to fulfil that minimum? We have, in part by hawking the sacraments, in part by countenancing neglect of them, brought upon ourselves the contempt of the world in almost the only form in which we should not covet it. Indeed, we have done so in order to stave off the contempt that is proper to us, the contempt accorded to those who are not apparently powerful. It is really rather frightening that even now such crucial issues as indiscriminate Baptism (and only less indiscriminate Confirmation) are shelved while we busy ourselves with tinkering with and elaborating machinery which loss of resources will almost certainly compel us to scrap.

There is need for a closing of the ranks. We just cannot afford to be free and easy now. But in closing the ranks there is also need to observe

who is with us and who against. The cleavage has largely ceased to be denominational. Rather it cuts through the denominations. A new "line-up" is far more probable than reunion all round. There is a proper disunity between the religion of the Church and sanctified humanism, a disunity which must emerge in any case but which had better be provoked. There is a fatal disunity between those who approach one struggle for one cause. Yet still the portent seems to pass largely unnoticed that some of the doughtiest and best equipped champions of the Creeds are Nonconformists. They provide Anglicans with a considerable part of their theological reading. So far as the most relevant and crucial division is concerned, that between Bible Christianity and "British Christianity," the need is that we sort ourselves, and the cause of true unity will best be served by uncovering that division.

Now it is most unlikely that in any of these matters there will be a change of policy on the part of the Church acting through its official channels. Indeed it is extremely difficult, whether for individuals or the Church as a whole, to put a new policy into effect, for we are very much tied up with the past and it is only in a measure that we can break loose. To a far greater degree we shall be moulded by circumstances. Change will be forced upon us. There is a certain inevitability about what is happening, a fact the recognition of which may lead us to pause before we blame those who have found themselves faced by earlier parallel developments elsewhere. We are in the grip of one of the processes of history. But it will be better to recognize the situation and, in so far as it is open to us to do so, to frame a policy in accordance with realities. The cry, "Evangelize," so fashionable to-day, is in great danger of becoming a parrot cry or magical incantation. Presumably to evangelize means to preach the Gospel faithfully. Too often, as used to-day, it means nothing more than the abandonment of patient and painstaking methods of winning souls for undertakings whose only recommendation is that they are novel and that it is fondly supposed that they will do quickly and spectacularly what can only be achieved by quiet and often disappointed perseverance. Could we show a more disastrous reaction to discomforting times?

It is, of course, possible that the whole situation may be revolutionized by the appearance of a prophet or by some unexpected swing of opinion and feeling. Such events cannot be manufactured, and it will be extremely dangerous to bank upon them, which surely is the very thing that we are doing. "Something will happen," we think, and bolster up our hopes with the thought. And indeed many things will happen, but whether they will be pleasant things is extremely doubtful. All that is certain is that the future is in the hands of God, and if that future is to be hard for us, we can perhaps have some insight into His purpose in it. Our German Pastor friends have told us of the efficacy of struggle. Out of the fight—a fight maybe for very existence—will come a purer, finer, truer Church—a real Church. Salvation will come to Laodicea.

FRANK BENNETT.

NESTON-IN-WIRRAL.

Comment on "Our Struggle"

Mr Bennett has blurted out, with admirable fluency and clarity, what a growing number of Christians in England is thinking and saying in private. We confess that we should like to be able either to contradict his premises or to dispute his conclusions, but we are not able to do so. The outlook seems to us very much what it does to him, and we do not think that there are yet many, if any, people who understand its meaning and its message, or even who see what are the first things that ought to be done. It is not, then, from any desire to reduce the force of what Mr Bennett says that we offer some comments, which should be regarded rather as addenda than as qualifications, though they may suggest a qualification of some of his expressions.

(1) "Our Struggle" is a statement of how things appear to a parish priest. Parish priests have a special responsibility for speaking out as well as for looking out, since they have been charged "to be Messengers, Watchmen, and Stewards of the Lord; to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family." They also have a special opportunity of knowing what is happening within the walls of the church. Moreover, they have an aptitude for expressing themselves about these weighty matters which the reticent layman has seldom acquired, and is not enough encouraged to exercise. We should like to have alongside Mr Bennett's statement of the case an equally discerning and candid report from a layman—not an ecclesiastical official—who sees these things in terms of work in a factory or an office or a camp. It is likely that in some respects he might paint an even darker picture; but he might reasonably be dissatisfied with Mr Bennett's definition of the struggle in which he is called upon to engage. At any rate, he would want to know what it implied concerning the future range of his activities and responsibilities.

The parish priest can perhaps face with a certain equanimity the prospect of the Church's being reduced to dimensions of a sect or of a dissident minority in the nation, because he at all events will then have a plainer and more congenial task to perform—"the training of stalwarts." But what about these stalwarts themselves? What will they be doing when they are not being "firmly grounded in their faith"? They will still have to live and work as citizens of a society which *ex hypothesi* has abandoned or rejected the faith in which they are being firmly grounded by their pastors. For we do not infer that Mr Bennett desires or contemplates the withdrawal of the stalwarts into detached communities. Are they not bound to become pietistic—*i.e.*, to acquiesce in a divorce between their faith as churchmen and their duty as citizens—unless they are shown how to prosecute a struggle in society, and not only against society or in spite of society?

(2) Not the least of the dangers in the prospect ahead is that the Church of England may cease to be a national Church, and may become content with the status of a sect or denomination. When a Church is spoken of as national, either of two quite distinct relations in which it stands may be in mind—its relation to the universal Church and its

relation to the whole nation. If a national Church means a Church that is national before it is universal, or a Church that places its loyalty to the nation before its loyalty to God and the Gospel, then it means an apostate Church. But in this case it should be described as a "nationalist" Church. Nationalism is an ever-present temptation not only for the Church of England but, quite as much, for other communions in England. Yet this may not in future be the chief temptation.

The danger in future may not be that the Church will be too national, but that it will not be national enough. It may cease to be related to or relate itself to the whole nation. For if by a national Church we mean a Church that is conscious of a mission to the whole nation, that acknowledges itself to be entrusted by God with the responsibility of declaring His Law and of ministering His Word and sacraments to the entire people, then a Church that refuses this calling, and confines (in effect, if not in ideal) its address and its ministrations to such individuals or groups as can be gathered out of the nation, is betraying its office. It is becoming an enclosed sect. We do not for a moment suppose that this is what Mr Bennett intends. But it is a danger of which many who will read his article with approval may be insufficiently aware. A true Church will be national in the sense we have indicated whether it is established or not. It will be national in intention before it is established; it will remain national and look forward to re-establishment if it is disestablished. The reason why the prospect of disestablishment or of non-juring must be regarded with great misgiving is that the tendency towards sectarianism or enclosure may then be almost as irresistible as the tendency towards "British Christianity" is at present.

(3) And for this reason we think that assertion of the duty of preparing a strong opposition within the coming State ought to be balanced, and indeed prefaced, by assertion of the duty of not letting go of that which will have to be opposed. For in fact it will be the duty of Christians to support as well as to oppose the State. Granted that the opposition of the Church to a pseudo-Christian society must be clearly marked, yet even a pseudo-Christian society is under the care and providence of God. The post-Christian, as well as the pre-Christian, "powers that be" are ordained of God; at least, if this is not so, let us be told plainly, and on what grounds. Although a Christian society is not a real possibility in England in the proximate future, the Christians must nevertheless believe that God wills to be obeyed as much in the State as in the Church. They must be active at every point and on every level in the national society, and they must do everything that is possible to bring its purposes and institutions more into line with the ordinances of God for man's natural and secular life.

From this it will follow that, when they are confronted with a choice of evils, they must be ready to co-operate with all who are striving to realize the lesser evil, which in that case is the greatest possible good. As A. S. Peake once said: "Every reformer discovers that he has to be content with less than the second-best, and to work with men whose motives and aims are other than his own."[1] The Christian stalwarts

[1] *Jeremiah* (Century Bible), i, 13.

should be notified as to this in advance; else they may stand aloof from politics, and fail to discriminate between the relative choices which alone are open in this field. The more the Church has to contract its organization and to tighten its discipline, the more necessary will it be to remind the Christians that they have to bear witness before the nation not only by preaching and an orderly and instructed living with the liturgy, but by showing that the Christian man is always bound to serve God in the State and by acknowledging that He is often well served there by those who know Him not. Thus we agree with *The Presbyter* (April, 1944), when it says: "It is clear that the post-war work of social building will be largely in the hands of men who acknowledge no Christian claim. It may even be that the conditioning factor in the whole situation will be the example and the influence of the secular Soviet Union. Christians can have a useful hand in this business, on which so much of human good depends, only if they can, without yielding one whit of their claim to judge the world, discern the work of God by the hands of those who deny Him."

(4) Finally, we think that Mr Bennett's use of the word "totalitarian" is misleading and confusing. Is it either accurate or wise to speak of totalitarianism as inevitable? A planned society does seem to be inevitable, but it is not bound to be totalitarian. "Totalitarian means all-comprehensive, including the private inner world of man."[1] The term should be applied to States which by every means in their power, ruthlessly and unscrupulously, inculcate a definite and exclusive ideology and seek to liquidate all minorities and all opposition. The planned society, which Mr Bennett envisages in England, will not be like that, since he expects that it will be possible to maintain an opposition, and therefore it is inaccurate to describe it as totalitarian. But even if totalitarianism, properly so-called, seemed imminent, it would still be unwise to speak of it as inevitable. For to do so would be to play into the hands of those who were seeking to bring it about and to restrain those who were determined at all costs to prevent it. It is the duty of everyone who sees what a terrible thing totalitarianism is to strive to prevent its coming until the last moment, and above all to refuse to admit that planning necessarily leads to totalitarianism, while being fully aware of the fact that it most easily does so. But it need not do so if there are sufficient people who are determined that it shall not do so.

These comments do not define an alternative struggle to that which Mr Bennett anticipates, and which we anticipate too, but they point to a complementary struggle. It is never easy to do two things at once, but that is what we have got to do. Unless the Church struggle incites those who participate in it to engage at the same time in the social struggle and to bring forth political good works, our last state may be worse than the first, and Laodicea may turn into a tyranny or a shambles. This is a war that must be fought on two fronts. It is important to distinguish them, and to see that each requires a different strategy and also different generalship. The living God is the Supreme Commander, but He appoints different subordinate officers for different

[1] Adolf Keller, *Church and State on the European Continent* (1936), p. 118.

tasks. In the Church struggle the clergy should be expected to take the lead, but they must never forget that the social struggle, where laymen must not only bear the brunt but also plan the campaign, is an equal part of the Christian struggle.

A. R. V.

Real Life is Being

Dr Oldham complained in 1942 that the importance of Martin Buber's *I and Thou* had been as yet so little perceived, which, he said, showed "with what difficulty truth that might save us is able to penetrate the crust of our inveterate habits of thought."[1] This seems well on the way to being rectified: we hear of the "intelligent layman" (that mythical hypostatization of an unreal universal) taking over the terminology of *I and Thou* with enthusiasm; and now the Archbishop of Canterbury[2] has added his name to the subscription list which votes that Real Life is Meeting. Perhaps it is time to put in a tentative plea for "inveterate habits of thought" under the pleasanter description of "traditional philosophy."

Buber's distinction (no doubt an old one, but very well worked out) between the radically different worlds of "*I-It*" and "*I-Thou*" does seem to be very helpful at first, and especially to anyone taking part in the cup-tie, Science *v.* Religion. Science is concerned with analysis of things, and therefore must treat even persons, psychological experience, emotions, what-not, as things, but there is the world where an *I* meets a *Thou*, where we are not concerned with statistics but with personal decision, and that world Science has nothing to say about. As soon as it starts to discuss meeting, decision, it turns the *Thou* into an *It*. So we can call the game off.

But "mate-in-two-moves" always arouses suspicion. There are two obvious snags in Buber which face one at the outset. (1) What *is* this mysterious transformation from one world (*I-Thou*) to the other (*I-It*): how does it happen and what governs its occurrence? (2) Supposing it be true that we cannot slide gently, only jerk, from one world to the other, and that the jerk comes at once whenever we objectify (*i.e.*, peruse, schematize, discuss) the moment of meeting, how can we talk about it at all—to which world, that is, does our talk, even about the transformation, belong? If to discuss the relation is immediately to "objectify" it (and therefore transform it), then the relation can never even be indicated in language (or any symbolic substitute), but disappears as we approach. It is like the dog trying to catch the tin tied to his tail, with the difference that we stand outside the dog and can see the tin, but no one stands outside language, so that we really have no guarantee that the relation, the *I-Thou*, exists at all. If the only proof for the existence of my shadow was to step on it, how could I ever know I had a shadow?

[1] *Real Life is Meeting*, C.N.L. Book.

[2] Supplement to *C.N.L.*, January, 1944. (Now issued as a pamphlet by the S.C.M. Press.)

Buber would no doubt have eluded such logical refutations by his emphasis upon the distinctness of the two worlds, dismissing the logic which tries to refute him to the world of *I-It*, and so putting *I-Thou* in safe quarantine. Time distinctions provide him with another barricade: "true beings are lived in the present, the life of objects is in the past," therefore the *I-Thou* is secure in its existential moment from the criticisms which come from the dead, museum, *I-It* world. The theme is not pursued into Bergson's bibliographical arena, but the approach is similar. And adjectives are piled up to show which way he wants the evidence to tell. In primitive man *I-Thou* predominated: but with the growth of consciousness and reason came the inevitable transformation into *I-It*—"that melancholy of our fate." The only qualification to the condemnation of *I-It* is the admission that thus alone could man have achieved order—"the *Thou* knows no system of co-ordination." Without *It* man cannot live, for we must have a reliable and common, social world. Nevertheless "he who lives with *It* alone is not a man"; the fleeting moments of individual communion with *Thou* give life meaning.

There is much that is valuable in the elucidation of the *I-Thou* relation: it throws light on the meaning of marriage and personal communion; on the real reason for the barrenness of contemporary social life, of State, power, and economics; on the efficacy of prayer and sacrifice. All this can teach us to reset our immediate problems. It is as an ultimate interpretation of human existence that Buber's book is defective, and, because defective, perhaps even dangerous in so far as it is thought to offer us a complete Weltanschauung. The logical difficulty has already been mentioned, that by using language to refer to a relation which language automatically transforms Buber must really reduce himself (and all theology) to silence. And the addition of the time distinction by no means eases the situation, for again the concept of the existential moment (Buber does not use the phrase, but it belongs to his thought) is quicksilver to the logical clutch: if the experience of *I-Thou* belongs to one kind of time (live time), and all analysis, debate, examination of it belongs to another (dead time), how can the two ever meet, and how can we even propose the first, much less talk about it? However these difficulties may be evaded, they point to a weakness in the structure of the argument. That weakness is, in fact, the location of a fissure where no complete fissure is logically possible. Buber has started from the fact that language, by its distinction between vocative and accusative, points to a distinction in reality. That is legitimate: but if we start from language, by language we must abide. Berdyaev has pointed out[1] the absence in Buber of stress upon the significance of "*We*"; he goes on, however, to use the *We* language to underline Buber's hatred of "objectification" ("objective" is even more of an expletive for Berdyaev than for Buber) and canonization of the immediate personal relation (which Berdyaev extends, by use of the *We*, to the Church, to the meaning of *Sobornost*). But the adult use of language does not imply so unbridgeable a gulf between vocative and accusative; the distinction

[1] *Solitude and Society.*

is there, of course, but language must deal impartially with all comers according to their status, and normal conversation suggests, what certain philosophical traditions have always held, that that status is ordered hierarchically. "Adult use," because Buber appears to be looking back with *nostalgie* to the child and the primitive as showing us the true personal significance of language. We can indeed learn from their natural, unsophisticated attitude to things and persons: even Maritain admits that "there is more truth—masked truth—in the religion of primitive man than in *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft.*"[1] And later, discussing the suggestion that modern state paganism is a "noxious return of primitive mentality," happily remarks: "I believe that there are grounds on which to defend primitive men against parallels unjust to them"! But Maritain also says that civilized man has "crossed the threshold of the state of logic, has entered into the daylight régime of the intelligence."

Having mentioned Maritain I shall now be expected to dismiss Buber with the usual charge of "anti-intellectualism." There is plenty to deserve the charge: there has been and can be, says Buber, no other talk about God's being and works than mistaken talk; God cannot be inferred in anything . . . something is not "given" and God then elicited from it, etc. All this would no doubt be condemned under the Vatican decree: "Si quis dixerit, Deum unum et verum, Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea, quæ facta sunt, naturali rationis humanæ lumine certo cognosci non posse; anathema sit." Now, I do think that anti-intellectualism is a serious charge: if no particular human faculty is especially privileged in God's sight to be the sound-box or sensitized plate which records the reception of revelation, at any rate the reverse is equally true—no particular faculty ought to be especially disqualified, least of all the intellectual. Whatever Luther may have said about the reason, Calvin was an intellectualist; so is Barth, and it is significant that his disciple, Mr Daniel Jenkins, pleads for a certain element of sophistication in theology (*Nature of Catholicity*). But I think it is possible to state a case against Buber without reference to scholasticism. Indeed, as regards his theism there is a more dubious statement than any of the above, at the section summed up in "You need God, in order to be—and God needs you, for the very meaning of your life" (p. 82). Here the Vatican anathema, "Si quis . . . Deum dixerit non voluntate ab omni necessitate libera, sed tam necessario creasse, quam necessario amat seipsum . . . anathema sit" ("If anyone . . . shall say that God created, not by His will, free from all necessity, but by a necessity equal to the necessity by which He loves Himself . . ."), could be echoed by non-scholastics. The non-Thomist case against Buber would rest rather upon the logical difficulties first mentioned, and their implications. Buber's dichotomizing of experience leads to one significantly dangerous result. He is careful, true, to say that "human life neither can nor ought to overcome the relation of *It*"; but first in looking at a tree, and later in a momentary imaginary conversation with his cat, he seems to be trying precisely to overcome the relation. We do not, he says, in becoming "bound up in relation" to

[1] *Redeeming the Time:* essay on "Sign and Symbol."

the tree, encounter a soul or dryad of the tree: we do not know whether it is possessed of a consciousness like ours. But, if anything, that makes the personification worse: we encounter "the tree itself"—and that looks like pure animism. And that is inevitable. If real life is concerned with the *I-Thou*, then ultimately we have to choose between some Manichean dismissal of the *I-It* world, or some transfiguration of all *Its* into *Thous*. Buber's is the better choice: but need there have been a choice at all?

Fr Victor White, O.P., expounding the view that the real culmination of the Atonement is in the Mass, well says: "By the Mass the barriers of space and time which separate us from Calvary are broken down. No effort of 'existentialist' theology to explain the 'contemporaneity' of the deed done 'once for all' in terms of an extra-temporal, extra-spatial '*I-Thou*' relationship can suffice for a Thomist to make present here and now the decisive 'moment' of Calvary."[1] Now Buber has not forgotten about sacramental worship. The cult, he says, is man's attempt to secure continuity of the *I-Thou* relation through time, and extension of it through space—that is, out of the individual's experience into the community of the faithful. And at first the cult does succeed in completing the act of relation. But soon it replaces it, becomes an end in itself, and again the *Thou* is lost in a new worship of *It*. The only way of preserving and extending the relation is by "embodying it in the whole stuff of life." Certainly. And certainly the cult can become an end in itself as he asserts. But that is merely one more legacy of Original Sin, from which the "whole stuff of life" is no more exempt. Barth, it will be remembered, has seen how easily "existentialism" can lead to yet another false natural theology ("Prolegomena to dogmatics cannot be produced even out of 'critical existence philosophy' "),[2] in spite of the fact that he once himself leaned on it. And it may be that the real case against Buber is that his language is not so Biblical as at first it sounds. Meanwhile we must use such methods of bridging the gap between *It* and *Thou* as we are shown: and the only secure bridge is the sacramental-incarnational way.

That sounds as if we were about to use the old language of a "sacramental principle"—continuity between natural sacraments and sacraments of the Gospel. On the contrary, it is just such a natural continuity which seems to be implied in the animism we have referred to; whereas what Christians believe is that by God's revelation through Christ, and sealing of it in history through appointed sacraments, the real relation of matter-life-mind is shown in their mobilization for the service of God. But this is incidentally a revelation concerning the *Being* of those creatures in their several grades. We cannot finally evade discussing the substantial nature of things, even if the alibi of "existential thinking" serves to excuse us for a while. Even Thomism, for all its apparent rigidity, allows of an intimate interplay between the layers of being, between the *I*, the *It* and the *Thou* (and above all the *We*): from man as centre the hard structure is softened—down-

[1] Essay in *What the Cross Means to Me*.
[2] *Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 43.

wards by the adæquatio mentis ad rem; upwards by the unification and vivification, the "flowering into life," of being as it approaches the centre of all Being, the *Visio Dei*. It may be that we, who are not Thomists, shall have for the present to accept the general philosophical scepticism about the scala naturæ, and seek our scale within the experience of personal will; though even those who think thus are still ready to claim that philosophical theology stands or falls by its defence of some doctrine of substantial being.[1] This is not the place to enter that discussion. But it can surely be said that if we are to start, as Buber does, from "primary words," there seems no decisive reason why *I*, *Thou* and *It* should be specially earmarked. In principio erat Verbum—*Verbum*, agreed: but also *erat*; *esse* is a more primary word still, because before relating, before meeting, God *is*.

Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R.

Mirfield.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office. By C. W. Dugmore. O.U.P. 10s. 6d.

The question of "Christian Origins" seems likely to receive a very different solution in our day from that put forward with so much learning and ingenuity by the *religionsgeschichtliche schule* in the 1900s. The new thesis is that all the main historical affiliations of primitive Christianity are with Palestinian Judaism. By the time of its first contacts with Hellenism Christianity was already fully equipped with ideas, institutions and rites of its own, derived from its Judaic roots, and had neither need nor temptation to borrow from the Mysteries. At the most a few technical terms (and those mostly not used in their technical sense) were taken over to describe ideas and rites for the benefit of Gentile converts.

Mr Dugmore's very interesting book is in line with the new trend of research, and brings it additional support, even though in some respects it does not altogether make out its particular case. The author's main thesis is that the "pro-anaphora" or "Mass of the Catechumens"—the first half of that combination of two different rites which now furnishes the outline of the eucharistic liturgy all over Christendom—is directly derived from the Synagogue liturgy of the first century A.D. This, of course, is not novel, but the evidence is here worked over much less cursorily than in the treatments the question has hitherto received. What emerges with certainty, I think, is that the Christian synaxis or pro-anaphora is indebted to the Synagogue liturgy for all its contents except its prayers. Here the author's thesis altogether breaks down, and would do so even more clearly if the contents of such pre-Nicene synaxis prayers had been examined beside

[1] *Vide* Austin Farrer, *Finite and Infinite*.

the Jewish ones. (There is no Christian evidence for the *liturgical* use of the Ten Commandments, which is the only point of contact Mr Dugmore finds.) The Christian prayers are placed after the lections and sermon, and so far as we know were always purely intercessory. The Jewish ones seem to have stood before the lections and sermon, and were much more varied in character. The distinction is already plain in Justin's account of Christian worship *c.* A.D. 155, and it needs explaining. But until we know with more certainty than we do at present just which items in the later Synagogue liturgy were already in use in the first century A.D., we cannot satisfactorily account for some of the Christian developments. It is right to add that Mr Dugmore in this essay goes some way towards illuminating some of these puzzles in the Jewish evidence.

But Mr Dugmore goes further, and insists that the origins of the Divine Office also are to be found in the Synagogue liturgy. That the pre-Nicene Church was accustomed to sanctify the chief hours of the day with prayer, and that this custom afterwards developed into the Offices of the Canonical Hours, is commonly accepted. But it is generally held that until the fourth century this was only a private devotion of the devout, not a corporate exercise. Mr Dugmore insists that even in the second and third centuries there were in many places public liturgical services, and that the "pro-anaphora" was also held daily in many churches. This part of his thesis is altogether less convincing. I have carefully examined all the references he gives to pre-Nicene authors in their context, and I can find nothing in any of them which satisfactorily supports his case. Some of the evidence he seems to overstrain a good deal. Thus (p. 41) Tertullian *ad Uxor.* II, iv does not refer at all to "regular vigils," as Mr Dugmore contends, for he explicitly speaks of *nocturnæ convocationes*, but only *si ita oportuerit*, and goes on to make it plain that the Paschal Vigil is the only "regular" occasion of a vigil service. (Are not the other occasions such exceptional necessities as those envisaged in *de Fuga in Pers.*, xiv?) So too (p. 46) Origen *in Ep. ad Rom.*, ix, 1, speaking of a husband and wife who *vacant orationi*, does not mean that they are "absent" from (!) "the set times of prayer in the churches," but that they give themselves to private prayer at home. (*Cf.* Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.*, xxxvi, 8 *sqq.*) As a Religious I should be glad to think that the Office as a public devotion was of pre-Nicene origin, but on the basis of Mr Dugmore's own evidence I am forced to believe it was not. The liturgical evidence (which the author has not examined) suggests strongly a double origin in the fourth century, one impulse and arrangement of it coming from the monasteries and *laurai* of Egypt, and the other, rather later, coming from the secular church of Jerusalem and the initiative of St Cyril. The events at Antioch in A.D. 348 related by Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist.*, ii, 24) appear to be the origin of the daily public vigil in secular churches.

On the weekday synaxes Mr Dugmore is on surer ground. But even here Origen's Homilies *in Gen.*, on which he chiefly relies to prove his point, do not, strictly speaking, witness to a general practice. They were preached at Cæsarea (not at Alexandria), and Pamphilus (*Ap. pro Orig.*, MPG, xvii, 454) remarks on his preaching there "almost daily"

as something exceptional. Even Hippolytus (*Ap. Trad.*, xxxiii and xxxv), who furnishes the only positive evidence I know for a daily synaxis in the third century, also adds: "If there is a day on which there is no instruction (καθήγησις)" in *Ap. Trad.*, xxxvi. How far is he speaking of what went on in the lecture-halls of Christian "teachers," rather than of assemblies for worship as such? It seems more in line with Mr Dugmore's real thesis than with his own presentation of it that the evidence indicates that the "pro-anaphora," which is directly derived from the Synagogue liturgy as regards both its form and most of its contents, was held several times a week like the Synagogue liturgy. The Office in its earliest forms cannot be schematically related to that liturgy, but it was unknown to the worship of the *ecclesia* for three centuries and only gradually evolved from the private devotions of Christians. It would appear that *only* a Jewish-derived worship was customary in the corporate rites of the pre-Nicene Church.

There is, however, a good deal to be learned from Mr Dugmore's book, especially about the Jewish evidence, which he handles more easily than the Christian. If I have seemed to treat it critically, that is because it deserves to be judged by a very high standard. English liturgical studies have gained a new recruit, and one who will be the more valuable in that he is specially equipped for service in that particular field upon which the main interest of research is bound to be centred for some years to come.

Gregory Dix, O.S.B.

Nashdom Abbey.

The Book of Isaiah, Vol. II (xl-lxvi). By E. J. Kissane. Browne and Nolan. 21s.

Those who remember the first instalment of Dr Kissane's work on Isaiah (1941, reviewed in Theology, April, 1942) have been eagerly awaiting the promised second volume. This volume follows the same general plan as its predecessor. An Introduction is followed by an original translation, interspersed with exegetical and critical comments. Textual points, such as references to the Hebrew text and the Versions, are wisely separated from the main commentary.

As in the earlier volume, so here, most of the blame for what Dr Kissane calls "the present chaos" in recent criticism of the book of Isaiah is laid at the door of Duhm. Against this arch critic and his many disciples, amongst whom, it is noted, are to be numbered many who would otherwise be regarded as conservative, weighty evidence is marshalled to prove the thesis that the whole of xl-lxvi "is composed on a uniform plan, and bears the impress of a single mind." The message of these chapters is summarized as a general treatment of the theme—"the Exile, and its place in God's plan for Israel and Mankind." Details are given of the ten sections into which these chapters are divided, each section being shown to consist of three distinct poems, followed by a "tailpiece," by way of conclusion. This part of the argu-

ment is attractive, but in view of what Dr Kissane says elsewhere about the conclusions of the critics, can he, or anyone else for that matter, legitimately claim that his suggested scheme is that "which was in the mind of the writer"?

With regard to the relationship of chapters xl-lxvi to i-xxxix, the plausible suggestion is made that the same individual was responsible for collecting the material now contained in i-xxxv, for adding the historical matter in xxxvi-xxxix, and also for the further addition of xl-lxvi, where the teaching of the earlier chapters is repeated for the benefit of the compiler's fellow exiles. Here a valiant attempt has been made to keep to the official caution of the Biblical Commission while at the same time admitting the exilic, or possibly post-exilic, standpoint of xl-lxvi. As in the case of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews (which analogy Dr Kissane himself uses), the most that can be said is tentative and, in the last resort, inconclusive.

Perhaps the most satisfactory part of this volume is the treatment of the so-called "servant songs." Duhm, and most commentators since his time, regarded these sections as independent of their context, but Dr Kissane claims, with good reason, that they are part and parcel of their present setting. He shows how this makes easier the interpretation of these poems, and concludes that there may well be "an element of truth in all the various interpretations of the 'servant of Jahweh.' " This has long seemed to many the most natural and acceptable way out of the confusion which has resulted from the many and varied discussions of the subject through the centuries.

An index, the absence of which was noted with regret in connexion with the first volume, has not been provided; it would have added to the usefulness and value of the work as a whole.

C. Witton-Davies.

St David's.

The Incarnation of the Word of God; being the treatise of St Athanasius De Incarnatione Verbi Dei newly translated into English by a Religious of C.S.M.V. Centenary Press. 5s.

If you wish for a picture of the Christian religion drawn by an artist who saw it with the eye of faith, you cannot do better than read St Athanasius *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*. So it is a great blessing to have a translation which can be read and enjoyed by any intelligent person, even if he has no knowledge of Greek; and the translator and the publisher are to be congratulated on having produced an attractive and readable book.

The volume opens with an introduction by Mr C. S. Lewis, who exhorts Christian people to read the classics of dogmatic as well as of ascetical theology. As usual, he writes persuasively and with conviction; but it is to be feared that he has not fully weighed the greatest difficulty which lies in the way. For the fact is that the treatise which is presented to us in this volume is very exceptional among the dogmatic writings of the Fathers in that it can be understood without the

possession of a great deal of knowledge of the doctrinal controversies of the time. Indeed, the book is so different from the other writings of St Athanasius himself that scholars have not always been as ready to agree that it is genuine as they are today. The only other dogmatic writings of Greek Fathers which seem to be suitable for the general reader are the catechetical works of St Cyril of Jerusalem and of St Gregory of Nyssa; but these will be found far less attractive than the work before us. A work which ought to be made available to the English reader who is interested in the Eastern Church is the second part of the trilogy of St John of Damascus, *Fons Scientiæ*. But this is nearly four and a half times the length of St Athanasius *On the Incarnation*, and it is not the stuff of which "best-sellers" are made.

The translation itself deserves high praise. It is extremely readable, and a few tests suggest that it is accurate. Both in its English style and in its printing it is a welcome departure from the manner of "cribs." There are no notes on the treatise of set purpose. While a profusion of these would certainly be undesirable, it would be useful for the reader who has no knowledge of Greek theology to have some guidance, for instance, concerning the sentence: "He, indeed, assumed humanity that we might become God" (p. 93).

It is impossible to convey a reasonable idea of the life of St Athanasius to someone who does not know the history of the fourth century in seven and a half small pages; and it would probably have added to the value of the book if the *Life* had been reduced to a list of dates and the remaining space devoted to a few notes on general topics. As it is, the reader is expected to know what is meant by the "Coptic temperament" (p. 17); the exiles of St Athanasius are mentioned without any explanation of why he was exiled: and Arius is described simply as teaching "concerning the Word of God that 'once He was not.'"

But these criticisms are a small matter to so excellent a volume. The translator would agree that the important thing is the treatise itself, and this, in its English dress as in its original Greek, will be found of very great value by those who take the trouble to read it.

Bernard Wigan.

Oxford.

The Prospects of Islam. By Laurence Browne. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Dr Browne is a distinguished scholar, well known in Christian circles for his admirable contribution to O.T. studies—*Early Judaism*. For some years he was associated with the School of Islamic Studies at Lahore in North India, and is at present Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester.

This book, though small in size, is closely packed and provides an excellent introduction to the study of modern Islam.

We must take seriously a religion and a culture which has not only in its heyday contributed much to the foundations of our own civilization, but which, by reason of its internationalism, its complete lack of

racialism and its missionary fervour, not to mention the large number of its adherents, has the strongest claim to be regarded as a world religion. Furthermore, the political implications of Islam need careful and objective consideration.

After looking at the history of the Caliphate, Dr Browne asks whether there is any possibility of the development of an Islamic Imperialism. It would seem that the Muslim nations are still too divided both by religious sectarianism and politico-social consideration for this to be likely. It is in this chapter that one finds matter which needs some degree of refutation. Dr Browne, as one might expect, is far more satisfactory when dealing with theological issues than when handling political questions. His references to India and the present tangled situation are by no means satisfactory. He falls into the common snare of regarding the Indian National Congress as "a Hindu body," and consequently thinks of the Muslim League and the exponents of Pakistan as altogether representative of Indian Muhammedans. This is certainly not the case, though it is true that, thanks to the blunders made by Indian nationalists, Mr Jinnah's policies have received greater support than hitherto. Yet at the beginning of the war in the Muslim majority provinces three[1] had coalition governments *not* controlled by the League and a fourth had a Congress government.[2] The present President of the "Hindu" Congress is Maulana Abu Kalam Azad, a far more devout Muslim than the leader of the Muslim League. He is actually well known throughout the Muslim world as an Islamic theologian. The succeeding chapters, "The Spiritual Urge" and "When Sufis looked to Jesus," are extremely interesting and valuable.

There follows a chapter on Modern movements. These include the Puritan Wahabis, a modernist tendency in India and the religion of the Bab which has become a separate new faith—Bahaism. Dr Browne rather tends to underrate this and to suggest that it represents a decline into materialism.

The last two chapters discuss Islam's lack as a religion and the book concludes with a recognition that Islam can contribute to the world an impressive emphasis on the need for worship, a large brotherhood and abounding zeal, and suggests that these virtues may find their best fulfilment within the Christian Church.

It would seem that the greatest deficiency of Islam lies in a materialistic tendency, which results in the crudest possible eschatology, an inadequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and a serious lack of any sacramental idea. To this can be added the extreme fundamentalism in regard to the Koran and a legalism which leads to self-satisfaction and checks progress. The development of a movement analogous to Higher Criticism might have beneficial results, but on the whole Dr Browne concludes that Islam has not within it the possibility of new contributions to the world's great need of a faith, though it might well degenerate into a purely political movement. This might be a danger to a world peace as well as being a tragedy in view of all that Islam has contributed in the past to the spirituality and culture of the world.

SPENNYMOOR. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

[1] Punjab, Sindh and Bengal. [2] Frontier Province.

SHORTER NOTICES

"THERE are those who think it disloyal to admit that there have been unworthy Popes (or even to examine the question) because the Pope is the Vicar of Christ. That is as though we refused to admit our own sins (or even to examine our consciences!) because we are the temples of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost has had some very odd temples and Christ has had some very odd Vicars." Thus with a certain nervousness the publishers introduce *Pageant of the Popes*, by John Farrow (Sheed and Ward, 16s.), in which the author, more heroic than wise, endeavours through a single, enormous chapter of 407 pages to give mention, honourable or otherwise, to every Pope. With a wealth of sobriquet and inversion, each one is made to parade across the narrow stage of papal politics, at one point as many as twenty-four in half a paragraph, but the effect upon the reader is not that intended by the pretentious title. The first quarter of the book is less like a pageant or "a spectacle arranged for effect" (O.E.D.) than a sorry procession of lay figures bowled over every few lines like ninepins. Perhaps a Protestant reviewer is convicted of invincible ignorance if he thinks that, with one or two exceptions, the figures begin to come to life only with Alexander VI and the explosive impact of the Reformation. For it is at this point that the book becomes readable, although it never attains the dignity of serious history. Its best part is the narrative of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Popes, which is at time almost exciting, but with the excitement induced by the speed and circumstantiality of the news-reel. In short, this book is of one dimension only, with length but neither breadth nor depth, and the opportunity of commending a great Roman institution not merely to Roman Catholics but to Protestants has been missed through a too mechanical scheme of composition.

Father Vincent McNabb, O.P. (Blackfriars, Oxford, 1s. 6d.) is a memorial reprint from *Blackfriars*, August, 1943, with additions, and is worth possessing if only for the moving sermon in which the preacher announces his own imminent death, and for an intriguing paper read at Oxford on "Scripture, Tradition and the Church." In this the author discusses Acts xv, 23-29, and finds in the mission of Judas and Silas as legates of an Ecumenical Council to the Church at Antioch the first evidence of the primacy to be accorded to the Church's living, teaching authority over the written word or Scripture of the Jerusalem decree. In a further discussion of the relation between Scripture and Tradition which is less startling in its rejection of Fundamentalism to those outside the Roman communion than to many within it, he does not hesitate to claim St Thomas as "the founder of the modern school of Biblical criticism." In connexion with this great Thomist it is appropriate to mention another *Blackfriars* supplement (9d.), *On the Manifestation of the Divine Knowledge*, by St Thomas Aquinas, being a translation (with notes) of Question II of the *Expositio super Bœtium De Trinitate.*

F. W. Head, a Sketch for those who Loved Him (S.P.C.K., 3s.) is a

slight but tender pledge of love to a husband and archbishop, with some pleasing photographs, "By his Wife."

In *English Colleges of Chantry Priests*, published by the Ecclesiological Society (S.P.C.K., 2s.), Prof. A Hamilton Thompson gives detailed examples of a type of foundation characteristic of the last two centuries which preceded the Reformation in England, and shows how they with their ready-made body of statutes provided a pattern for the new cathedral foundations of Henry VIII.

The title of *I Believe in One God*, ed. M. Avery (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), is misleading, since it suggests a dogmatic treatise rather than "a book for the quiet time." In it, however, the Creed provides the basis for some excellently factual meditations designed for the intelligent boy and girl of secondary-school type. More detailed guidance in the art of meditation would perhaps have been included with advantage to the youthful users of this book.

Nine O'Clock (S.P.C.K., 3d.) claims attention as "the contribution of the Anglican Church to the Big Ben Silent Minute Observance," and has a foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Ejaculatory prayers and points for meditation, to fit the chimes and strokes of the clock, of varying merit are offered, of which the simplest, as usual, are the best. Perhaps a saint *could* reflect upon nine attributes of God in sixty seconds, but would he try? *The Master of Time*, by Max Warren (S.P.C.K., no price stated), seeks to ease the problem of "I haven't got time . . ." by the study of our Lord's example in the crisis of the Passion. The Basic English version is adopted for "a certain clarity which distinguishes it." The Lord's mastery of time is seen with real insight to rest in His absolute dependence upon His Father, in "His active belief that a person living in time," with whom we have to deal, "is the NOW of Eternity incarnate," and in His conviction of the transient character of evil. *In Watchings Often*, by Godfrey Worsley (S.P.C.K., 9d.), is a singularly attractive booklet of prayers, handy for the waistcoat pocket. *A Padre's Talks on Confirmation*, by another chaplain, Brynley L. Jones, combines sound Church teaching and conventional "breeziness" for Service candidates whose preparation is liable to interruption by army movements, and is designed to help one chaplain to pick up the work of another. Conductors of war-time intercessions will find in *Come unto Me*, by Arthur C. Clague (S.P.C.K., 9d.), a useful series of well-planned services, solidly based on Scripture yet suited to the present need.

The Whole Church, by Max Warren (S.P.C.K., 4d.), states "the Evangelical reading of the situation" in South India, accepts bishops as a practical necessity in the united Church of the future, "which will be unlike any Church at present existing," but is resolute against any specific doctrine of episcopacy or of the sacraments.

A Batsford Century, ed. Hector Bolitho (Batsford, 10s. 6d.), is a beautifully printed and illustrated retrospect by associates of the well-known architectural and engineering publishers, confessedly limited in its appeal, but admirably appropriate to its occasion.

G. E. P. Cox.

GRACE AND TRUTH. By Ernest Evans. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

THE SEVEN SIGNS OF CHRIST. By Father Andrew, S.D.C. Mowbrays. 2s.

THE BIBLE SPEAKS TO OUR DAY. By George Barclay, S.C.M. 2s. 6d.

THINGS WHICH ABIDE. By R. Abba. Epworth Press. 6s.

SOME NOTES ON THE GOSPELS. By D. M. McIntyre. I.V.F. 1s. 6d.

THE WORLD CHRIST KNEW. By Antony C. Deane. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 5s.

The supreme test for any book about the Bible is: does it help us toward the hearing of God's Word in our own situation?

Canon Evans gives us six addresses based on the first six chapters of the Fourth Gospel, intended mainly for candidates on the eve of their ordination. Judged by the supreme test this book is disappointing. It oscillates between a rather academic exegesis, occasionally illuminating but rarely sustained, and rather desultory moralistic advice only loosely connected with the text. This is to misuse Holy Scripture: instead of helping us to hear God's Word, Canon Evans makes it a peg for his own words. But why use that particular peg?

Father Andrew gives us seven meditations on the miracles of the Fourth Gospel, written with his characteristic charm of style. The author is undoubtedly right in saying that signs point beyond themselves. But to what do they point? To some general "spiritual" truth or metaphysical doctrine, however true or edifying, or to the Event of the Cross? In other words, do the signs point to some word of man or to the Word of God? The Fourth Evangelist leaves us in no doubt when he says that the first sign was only a sign and nothing more, because the Lord's "hour was not yet come."

It was refreshing to turn to Mr Barclay, whose deliberate aim was to let the Word of God speak for itself, and not to use it as a peg for his own moralizations or meditations. Mr Barclay takes different passages from the Old and New Testaments in order to illustrate the parallel between the Biblical situations and our own, and to let the word God spoke to them speak to our situation. Sometimes, however, we are left with the uncomfortable feeling that we hear instead the platitudes of Anglo-Saxon idealism—*e.g.*, on the question of Russia. Mr Barclay's exegesis is not always sufficiently disciplined.

Mr Abba achieves what Mr Barclay just misses. These nineteen sermons, preached to a Sheffield Congregational Church, are an orderly presentation of biblical doctrine in its contemporary relevance. It does for a city congregation what Dr Whale did for university students in his *Christian Doctrine*. Parish priests who want to give their congregations the full truth of the Bible without being too technical or seemingly irrelevant should study this book.

The last two books are not exegesis, but necessary preliminaries thereto. Dr McIntyre gives a learned survey of the work done during the last fifty years on the Synoptic Problem, Form Criticism and the Fourth Gospel. His own conclusions are generally similar to those of Conservative critics before 1914. Dr McIntyre frankly allows his piety

to determine his critical judgments—*e.g.*, on the historicity of the Fourth Gospel. Nevertheless, we welcome this readiness of the I.V.F. to discuss critical problems, and we hope that they will publish more work on these lines, which is not merely apologetic, but which will bring out the positive contribution which critical discipline has made to the understanding of the Gospels.

Canon Deane's book is a new and revised edition of *When Christ Came*, modified for the general public. It is a sound and scholarly, yet characteristically lucid and readable, account of the political, economic and social environment in Palestine in the time of our Lord. These matters are to the Christian interesting and important, not merely for their own sake, but for the light they throw on the Gospel narratives. It is just this that Canon Deane brings out so well.

R. H. Fuller.

Ashbourne.

Thomas Bray, 1658-1730, Founder of Missionary Enterprise. By John Wolfe Lydekker. Contributions of the S.P.G. to the American Way of Life. By Frank J. Klingberg. Church Historical Society, Philadelphia. 50 cents.

The two essays in this brochure were first printed last September in the excellent *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*. It is a curious fact that, although as principal founder both of the S.P.G. and of the S.P.C.K., as well as of the many libraries which bear his name, the name of Thomas Bray is as well known as that of any other clergyman of his time, yet the literature about him is relatively small and little is generally known of the facts of his life. Mr Lydekker tells us that he had intended to compile a "full-length" biography, but had been prevented by paucity of material. He has, however, given us here the best short account of Bray that has yet appeared. In 1696 Bray was appointed Commissary of Maryland by Bishop Compton of London, and, in seeking to recruit clergy to accompany him to the province, he found that he could only obtain poor men who could not afford to buy books, and, rightly conceiving that such men would deteriorate without proper educational facilities, he began to draw up his schemes for founding libraries for them. While thus engaged he was forced to consider the whole question of the effectual propagation of Christianity in the colonies and, incidentally, in England, and so finally he was led to the resolution which resulted in the foundation of the two great societies for this purpose. The intention of Bray and his associates was, as Professor Klingberg states, "the equalization of Christian culture on both sides of the Atlantic," and their genius lay "in their complete understanding of the frontier problem of intellectual poverty in all its ramifications." The steps which they took to remedy this poverty not only resulted in the willingness of men of high calibre to work in the colonies, but did indeed influence the whole way of American culture and life.

Considerations of space have dictated that Professor Klingberg's

treatment of his subject is too slight to be other than introductory, and it needs supplementing by such works as the fourth volume of Professor Latourette's great *History of the Expansion of Christianity* or by the works of Professor W. W. Sweet.

HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH.

ST IVES.

THE WRATH AND PEACE OF GOD. By Stephen Neill. Christian Literature Society for India. 2s. 6d.

This book contains four addresses which the Bishop of Tinnevelly gave to an Indian Missionary Convention in 1942. They are in the form of expositions of certain passages in the Epistle to the Romans. They are plainly the outcome of long and profound study, but the Bishop wears his learning lightly; it is wedded to the insight of a pastor and is salted with humour. Though the task and condition of the Church in India are in view throughout, readers in England will find that the addresses strike home here too. For this is the kind of biblical exposition for which many the world over are hungry. Would that all the Church's bishops were able and free to give themselves more to it!

The book can be obtained in England through the Lutterworth Press at Doran Court, Reigate Road, Redhill. In India it has already gone into a second edition.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

A.P.C.K. (DUBLIN): R. P. C. Hanson, *The Purpose and Practice of the Discussion Group* (6d.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: W. Butterfield, *Be Ye Perfect* (3s. 6d.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA (LUTTERWORTH PRESS): G. Holland, *Christendom in the Modern World* (1s. 3d.); W. M. Ryburn, *The Message of Jesus for our Times* (1s. 3d.).

COBBETT PUBLISHING CO: S. Evans, *The Churches in the U.S.S.R.* (5s.).

DACRE PRESS: Macarius of Optino, *Russian Letters of Direction*, 1834-1860, Trans. by Iulia de Beausobre (5s.).

EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND: Syllabus of Religious Instruction for use in Church Day Schools, approved by the Bishops for experimental use (n.p.).

FABER AND FABER: A. G. Herbert, *The Form of the Church* (8s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (8s. 6d.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: A. Y. P. A. *Unto a Full-grown Man* (3s.).

S. C. M. PRESS: E. Cailliet, *The Clue to Pascal* (6s.); N. Zernov, *Three Russian Philosophers* (8s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: F. J. Sheed, *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (10s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher